

who, despite his ambiguous statements about war and women, remains influential among a certain part of the audience.

One of the main differences between bloggers and journalists is the way they interact with their audience. Bloggers actively use parasocial connections – the illusion of personal friendship with their followers, which creates a certain addiction to the content. Therefore, their fans continue to follow them, even if the blogger allows himself controversial statements. For instance, Oleksiy Durnev maintains a large audience, despite his incorrect jokes and assertions.

Another difference is the commercialization of blogging. Bloggers actively monetize their popularity through advertising, selling their own merch, and organizing fan meetings. In contrast, journalists focus on the quality of information, working within professional standards that limit their independence compared to bloggers [3].

Given these differences, it can be argued that bloggers and journalists are representatives of two different fields, although their cooperation is possible. Bloggers can learn from journalists about fact-checking and analytics, but the transition from blogging to journalism requires deeper professional training [4].

In summary, it should be emphasized that bloggers and journalists have different goals and methods of work, and although they can cooperate, they cannot be equated. It is important for information consumers to be critical of content, regardless of who provides it.

References:

1. Ethics Code of Ukrainian Journalists. PressCouncils.eu. URL: https://www.presscouncils.eu/codes/51_ua/
2. "Voice of Ukraine". (2019). The editorial board of the newspaper "Voice of Ukraine" does not share the position of Vasyl Chepurny. URL: <https://www.golos.com.ua/article/318077>
3. Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2021). *The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect*. Three Rivers Press. 432 p.
4. Lavryk, O. (2008). *Fundamentals of Journalism*. V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. 73 p.

THE REASONS OF THE DEFEAT OF THE CENTRAL RADA

ANASTASIIA POPADIUK, student

IHOR I. BOYKO, Associate Professor, PhD in Law, Scientific Adviser

ALLA I. RADU, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Language Adviser

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

The defeat of the Central Rada was caused by a combination of internal and external factors that undermined its ability to govern effectively and defend Ukraine's independence. One of the primary reasons was the lack of a strong military force. The Central Rada failed to establish a well-organized army capable of resisting external threats, particularly from the Bolshevik forces [1]. The

reliance on poorly disciplined volunteer units and the lack of centralized command weakened Ukraine's defense.

Another significant issue was the political fragmentation and internal conflicts. The Central Rada faced opposition from various political groups, including left-wing radicals and conservative elements [2]. This division prevented the formation of a unified national movement and made decision-making ineffective. Furthermore, economic instability and the lack of financial resources played a crucial role. The government struggled with taxation, inflation, and the lack of industrial capacity, which made it difficult to support state structures and military efforts [3]. The diplomatic miscalculations of the Central Rada also contributed to its downfall. Its attempt to gain international recognition was unsuccessful, and it lacked strong allies who could provide military or economic assistance. Meanwhile, Bolshevik Russia, using propaganda and military force, managed to undermine the Rada's legitimacy [2]. 000

Finally, the low level of support among the rural population weakened the government's position. Although the Central Rada attempted land reforms, they were not implemented effectively, causing dissatisfaction among peasants, who formed the majority of Ukraine's population [1].

In conclusion, the combination of weak military structures, political divisions, economic problems, diplomatic failures, and insufficient popular support of the people led to the collapse of the Central Rada. These lessons remain relevant for understanding state-building processes in modern Ukraine.

References:

1. Грушевський М. С. Історія України-Руси, Київ, 1995. <http://litopys.org.ua/hrushrus/iur.htm>
2. Дорошенко Д. І. Нарис історії України, Мюнхен, 1957. <https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0003941>
3. Субтельний О. Україна: Історія, Торонто, 1991. <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua>

THE FUNCTION OF GERUND AND INFINITIVES IN MODERN ENGLISH BY WALTER ISAACSON'S «STEVE JOBS»

YULIYA POTAPENKO, student

ALLA M. KROKHMAL, Associate Professor, PhD in Pedagogy, Scientific Adviser

O. M. Beketov National University of Municipal Economy in Kharkiv

• Introduction

The English language, as a dynamic and evolving linguistic system, employs various grammatical structures to convey meaning effectively. Among these structures, gerunds and infinitives play a crucial role in syntactic organization and stylistic variation. This study examines their functions in contemporary English, focusing on their use in the biography *Steve Jobs* by Walter Isaacson. The analysis